IOSR Journal Of Humanities And Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)
Volume 24, Issue 10, Series. 1 (October. 2019) 65-73
e-ISSN: 2279-0837, p-ISSN: 2279-0845.
www.iosrjournals.org

The Effect of Using Cooperative Learning Strategy on History Achievementat State Senior High School (MAN) in Medan, Indonesia

Wahyudin Nur Nasution[1]&Asnil Aidah Ritonga[2]
[1,2]*Universitas Islam Negeri Sumatera Utara Medan, Indonesia*

The objective in this study is to test the effect of cooperative learning strategy on history achievement based on the students' self-concept. This study was conducted by using quasi-experimental design. The research population was students in class XII MAN in Medan, Indonesia. There were 68 students, as research samples, distributed in two different Madrasah classes. Data was analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics in a two-way ANOVA. The result obtained from the study shows the highest history achievement is accomplished by students who were given cooperative strategy. Students with high self-concept have higher history achievement with cooperative strategy than learning by expository strategy. On the other hand, students with low self-concept attained higher history achievement with expository strategy than cooperative. There is an influence between learning strategy and self-concept to the history achievement.

Keyword: History achievement, Cooperative learning strategy, Self-concept

---

Date of Submission: 18-09-2019 Date of Acceptance: 05-10-2019

I. INTRODUCTION

History teaching is meaningful to grow the nationalism and patriotism values in students. The challenge in teaching history in schools has been paid the most attention to by teachers and historians. According to Crabtree (2001), many primary school students in the U.S dislike learning history. Many of them complained that history is a boring subject, while the other do not see the importance of learning about people and historical events. This aligns with the opinion from Nair &Narayanasamy (2017) that most students think that history is a boring and useless subject.

In Indonesia, history has strategic meanings in creating dignified characters and civilization with nationalism. It can be used to build collective memory of the nation in order to acknowledge its identity as well as to pursue the unity as provision for Indonesia's development (Pengetahuan dan Teknologi.com, 2016). Therefore, in Indonesia curriculum, history is made mandatory in secondary schools (Permendikbud RI No. 21, 2016).

However, based on the observation and interviews with the history teachers and students in Madrasah Aliyah Negeri (MAN) in Medan showed that there is a big number of students who see history as an uninteresting and unimportant subject. They have difficulties in understanding the subject and as a result many students attained low learning outcomes in history. Unsuitable learning strategies applied in the classrooms may be the cause of the low history achievement as mentioned above. According to Obeka (2014), learning strategy used by teachers is an important factor to improve students' learning outcome. With the facts presented, there is a need to design learning method to improve students' performance in history .

One of the learning strategies to improve students' learning achievement is cooperative strategy. A study by Slavin (1990) showed that the application of cooperative strategy helped the students to attain higher academic achievement. Gubbad (2010) showed that cooperative learning has got a significant influence to the improvement of students' academic achievement. This is in accordance with the study done by Fini, Zainlipour and Jamri (2012) which stated that the application of cooperative strategy has a great influence to students' achievement. The study conducted by Toklucu and Tray (2016) concluded that the approach of cooperative learning is effective to improve students' achievement and recollection of history .

The success of history learning is influenced by several factors, with self-concept as one of them. Self-concept is the combination of the mind, feeling and attitude in oneself (Woolfolk, 2004). According to Atwater (1990), a person with high self-concept has several characteristics such as having high self-acceptance, tendency to accept others, expectation of the best achievement, hard-work attitude and tendency to be successful in the career and ability. According to Ahmad, Gazali and Hasan (2011), self-concept is one of the factors that affect students' learning achievement.There is a few studies about the application of cooperative strategy in history

teachings. Most studies are about cooperative strategy in teaching science and mathematics. Therefore, this research focuses on the impact of cooperative strategy adoption and self-concept to history learning.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 History achievement

Basically, learning achievement is new ability, skill and behavior from training or experience. This learning result is often stated in the form of learning objectives (Woolfolk, 2004). Gagne and friends (2005) stated that learning outcome is the ability obtained by an individual after going through learning process.

Bloom (1975) divided learning outcome into three domains which are cognitive, affective and psychomotor. According to Yaumi (2014), learning outcome is referred to three components such as knowledge, behavior and skill. According to Anderso and Krathwohl (2001), learning outcome from cognitive domain has got two dimensions such as knowledge and cognitive process. Knowledge domain, on the other hand, has got four categories, which are factual, conceptual, procedural and metacognitive knowledge. Whereas congnitive process dimensions consist of six categories such as remembering, understanding, applying, analyzing, assessing and creating.

History in Arabic is *syajaratun* which means trees. A tree consists of roots, branches, twigs and leaves. Therefore, history is interpreted as the origin, profile and pedigree that resemble a tree. In Arabic, the study about historical events is called *Tarikh*. In Europe, history is known as *history* (English), *histoire* (French), *storia* (Italian). Those are Greek that gives historia a term that describes a smart person. From that, history can be used to refer to past events in human lives (Setyawan, 2016).

From the description in the literature review, the conceptual meaning of history achievement in this research is the mastery of history achieved by students after a certain time of learning process based on the objectives set.

2.2 Cooperative and Expository Learning Strategies

a. Cooperative Learning Strategy

Cooperative learning strategy is s strategy where students work together in small groups to learn about the material given and they are awarded with the success of the group (Slavin, 1995; Henson & Eller, 1999;Cruisckshank, Jenkins, and Metcalf, 2006). The awarding has pushed each member to help one another in order to master the material and to reach the same goals. In cooperative learning strategy, students are trained and made used to of knowledge, experience, task and responsibility sharing (Ngalimun, 2016). The team members in this strategy are responsible for group task completion and self-learning of the material (Suprihatiningrum, 2016).

There are three objectives in the application of cooperative learning strategy. They are the improvement in academic achievement, acceptance to diversity and the development of social skill Arends, 1998; Alrasydin and Nasution, 2015; Suprihatiningrum, 2016). According to Leighton (1990), the success of improving achievement to academic field through cooperative learning strategy depends on three important characteristics, such as group goals, individual responsibility and the same opportunity to succeed. Group goals are usually expressed in the form of award based on the success of groups in the academic task given. Individual responsibility is related to the material mastery appraisal of each students (Slavin, 1995). With the same opportunity given to success in cooperative learning has strengthen students' perspective about academic achievement is attained from the effort given in and does not only comes naturally since birth (Suprihatiningrum, 2016).

Cooperative learning strategy has been developed intensively through a number of researches. There are three cooperative learning strategies that can be developed to almost all subjects and levels, such as: (1) Students Teams Achievement Division (STAD), (2) Team Games Tournament and (3) Jigsaw II. The other two approaches designed to certain subjects and levels are Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition (CIRC) for reading and writing teaching for 2 – 8-year-old students and Team Accelerated Instruction (TAI) for mathematics for 3 – 6-year-old students (Slavin, 1995; Nasution, 2017). The strategy used in this study consists of several stages as follow: (1) Delivering learning objectives and motivating students; (2) Presenting information; (3) Organizing students into study groups; (4) Guiding working and study groups; (5) Quiz/evaluation (individual test); and (6) Awarding (Ibrahim, *et al*., 2006; Cruickshank, Jenkins, and Metcalf, 2006)

b. Expository Learning Strategy

The term expository comes from exposition concept which has the meaning of giving explanation. Exposition is the name of the strategy used by teachers for explaining or describing facts, ideas and other important information to students (Jarolimek and Foster, 1981; Cruickshank, Jenkins, and Metcalf, 2006). Expository learning strategy is based on information processing theory (Miarso, 2004). The aims of this learning

strategy are to provide knowledge, ideas, concept, explanation and skills to the learners (Jarolimek and Foster, 1981; Cruickshank, Jenkins, and Metcalf, 2006).

Expository learning strategy is a learning process that focuses on teachers (teacher-centered). Teachers are the source and providers of main information (Jacobson, Eggen, and Kauchack, 1989; Cruickshank, Jenkins, and Metcalf, 2006). In this strategy, media like educational videos and visual-aid are used to support the explanation given by teachers. According to Ormrod (2000) the addition of verbal explanation with visual-aid improves the effectiveness of information storage in the long-term memory and ease the process of getting the memory back.

The stages in expository learning strategy are as follow: (1) In the introduction stage, teachers communicate the main subject matters to be discussed and learning objectives to be reached. The learners listen and write down the things that are considered as important, (2) At the subject matter presentation, teachers deliver the material by lectures and question-and-answer session, followed by some demonstrations to clarify the material delivered and ended by exercise delivery, (3) In the closing stage, teachers do evaluation such as tests and follow up activities like assigning tasks for improvement, mastery and advancement of the material.

2.3 **Self-concept**

Kosslyn and Rosenberg (2001) stated that self-concept refers to the beliefs, desire, values and characters set by an individual to itself. Canfield and Wells (1976) stated that self-concept is the combination of all beliefs and behaviors of one to itself. Based on the opinion above, it can be concluded that self-concept is the self-image of a student that includes the accumulated image, feeling and judgement in its perception about physical, social and psychology quality owned by oneself (Nasution, 2018).

From the types, self-concept can be classified into two such as high self-concept and low self-concept. High self-concept (positive) can be equated to positive self-evaluation, self-awarding, self-esteem and self-acceptance (Burn, 1979; Nasution, 2017). According to Hurlock (1974), children with high self-concept are able to develop self-confidence, have realistic view of themselves and have high self-esteem. Some characteristics of people with high self-esteem are having high self-acceptance, tendency to accept others and expectation to get the best achievement. Moreover, they are hardworking and tend to be successful in the career and skills (Atwater, 1990).

Meanwhile, low self-concept (negative) is equal to negative self-evaluation, hating oneself, being low profile and not having self-appreciation and acceptance (Burn, 1979). According to Hurlock (1974), children with low self-concept (negative) will develop less pleasant social adaptation, have unstable feelings, be inferior, use plenty of self-defense mechanism and have low self-esteem. People with low profile have no self-confidence, tend to expect for the worst, are not working hard for the tasks and are less successful in the career (Atwater, 1990; Meier, 2004).

III. METHOD

The approach used in this research is quasi-experimental design with 2 x 2 group factorial design. The dependent variable is the history achievement. The first independent variable as the treatment is the learning strategy (cooperative strategy as the experiment and expository strategy as the control). The second independent variable is self-concept attribute which can be divided into high and low self-concept. Below is the experimental design matrix for this study.

Table 1 : Experimental Design Factorial 2 x 2

Treatment Variable (P) / Attribute Variable (Q)	Cooperative (P_1)	Expository (P_2)
High Self-concept (Q_1)	P_1Q_1	P_2Q_1
Low Self-concept (Q_2)	P_1Q_2	P_2Q_2

The target population in this research is all class XII students in MAN, Medan. Whereas the reachable population is all class XII students in MAN for 2018/2019 academic year in Medan. The sampling was conducted in several stages. In the first stage, purposively determined twoMAN for the research where the experiment was conducted. For this, two MAN with several similar characteristics, for example MAN ranking in the district area, school's geographical social environment and the education or quality of teachers for History subject, were chosen. Next, to be more certain that the two subjects chosen are the same, the equation test for two average (mean) was conducted by using t-test (Sudjana, 1996; Creswell, 2014) for the initial achievement of students' in class XII in the form of final test (UAS) score for History in class XI second semester.

Then the two MAN were chosen randomly to two groups, experimental and control groups. Experimental group is MAN 2 Model Medan while control group is MAN 1 Medan with 40 students in each school. In the second stage, each group of students were classified into two, such as the group of high self-concept students and low self-concept students. Self-concept of students' population was measured by Likert model. The score obtained from the measurement was being ranked next. There were 42% of high group that was classified into high self-concept group and 42% of low group which was put into low self-concept group. Based on the sampling data, the overall composition of research sample is concluded in the table below.

Table 2: Research Subject Composition based on the Location and Treatment Type

Location & Treatment Type / **Self-concept**	**MAN 2 Model Medan**	**MAN 1 Medan**	**Total**
	Cooperative	**Expository**	
High	17	17	34
Low	17	17	34
Total	34	34	68

The research treatment in this case is the experiment in the form of providing history subject teaching with cooperative and expository learning strategies. The treatment was given for 8 meetings. The material taught was about "The Effort of Defending the National and the Republic of Indonesia's Integrity". This material is developed into two learning strategies, such as cooperative and expository learning strategies.

The instruments used in the study were review test and Likert model measurement scale. The review test was used to measure thevariable for history achievement, while Likert model measurement scale was used to determine self-concept variable. History achievement instrument was prepared in the form of an objective test (multiple choice). Before the instrument was used to collect research data, there was a trial to external respondents, who are not parts of the research sample, by using biserial point correlation formula. There were 40 questions in the instrument, trialed to 35 external respondents. From the calculation of each questions, 4 questions were found to have low or insignificant correlation with $r_{calculation} < r_{table}$ 0.33. Then for valid questions, KR-20 formula was used to calculate the reliability. The calculation resulted in r = 0.84 which means that the instrument has fulfilled the reliability requirement as the measuring instrument in the study.

Self-concept instrument consists of 42 questions. Prior to instrument usage to collect the research data, trial to test the validity was done with product moment correlation from Pearson. This aligns with the opinion from Fraenkel and Wallen (1993) that stated if data is in interval scale or ratio form, then the correlation coefficient of product moment from Pearson can be used. From the analysis, there were 5 questions with very low correlations or $r_{calculation} < r_{table}$ 0.334. Next reliability measurement was done to the valid questions by using Alpha Cronbach formula. From the calculation, 0.81 reliability was obtained which means that self-concept instruments have fulfilled the reliability requirement as measuring instrument.

Data analysis in this research is needed to generally describe research data and asses research hypothesis. To describe data, descriptive statistics was used, whereas two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to asses hypothesis proposed in the research. Before the data was analyzed, there were tests for statistics analysis requirement, such as normality and homogeneity tests. If the analysis of variance shows significant interaction between independent and dependent variables, then the analysis can be continued by using Tukey's HSD (Honestly Significant Difference) test or in short, Tukey's test (Ferguson & Takane, 1989).

III. RESEARCH FINDING

3.1 Data Description

Overall research data for the result of students learning history is summarized in Table 3 below.

Table 3: Students' Achievement Data in History

Learning Strategy / **Self-concept**	**Cooperative**	**Expository**	**Total**
High	n = 17 $\overline{X}$ = 80.76 s = 7.05	n = 17 $\overline{X}$ = 53.88 s = 10.01	n = 34 $\overline{X}$ =67.32 s = 8.53
Low	n = 17 $\overline{X}$ = 60.65 s = 8.01	n = 17 $\overline{X}$ = 68.18 s = 7.06	n = 34 $\overline{X}$ = 64.42 s = 7.54

Total	n = 34 $\overline{X}$ = 70.71 s = 7.53	n = 34 $\overline{X}$ = 60.73 s = 8.54	

3.2 Analysis Requirement Test

To test the proposed hypothesis in this study, two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted. Therefore prior to analysis of collected data, ANOVA requirement tests done were normality and homogeneity tests. The normality test for sample in this study was done by Lilliefors test. The summary of normality test with significant level, $\alpha = 0.05$, to each sample group can be seen in the table below.

Table 4: Normality Test for Achievement Data in History

Data Group	N	L_o	L_t	Remarks
1. Group P_1	34	0.1264	0.1454	Normal
2. Group P_2	34	0.1215	0.1454	Normal
3. Group Q_1	34	0.0897	0.1454	Normal
4. Group Q_2	34	0.1411	0.1454	Normal
5. Group P_1Q_1	17	0.1647	0.2060	Normal
6. Group P_2B_1	17	0.1289	0.2060	Normal
7. Group P_1Q_2	17	0.1893	0.2060	Normal
8. Group P_2Q_2	17	0.1974	0.2060	Normal

Meanwhile, homogeneity test aims to identify whether research sample comes from a homogenous population. The result of homogeneity variance of the two groups in this research is 2.17 and 2.75 homogeneity index variance between the two tested groups (F_o) and $F_{t(0,01:33,33)}$ respectively. With $F_o < F_t$, it shows that H_o is accepted. In other words, the two tested groups (group Q_1 and Q_2) are homogenous. To test homogeneity variance of the four groups from each experimental group, Bartlett test was conducted with significance level of (α) = 0.05; where it compares the value of $\chi^2_{calculation}$ with χ^2_{table}. Based on the calculation, $\chi^2_{calculation} = 7.36 < \chi^2_{table} = 7.81$, therefore it can be said that the four achievements data in history tested are homogenous.

Table 5: Summary of Homogeneity Test Variance of Score History
Achievement for the Four Designed Experimental Groups

Group	Variance (s^2)	Combined Variance (s^2)	B Value	χ_o^2	$\chi_{t(95;3)}^2$	Remarks
P_1Q_1 P_2Q_1 P_1Q_2 P_2Q_2	49.69 100.24 64.02 49.78	70.05	118.4	7.36	7.82	Homogenous

3.4 Hypothesis Test

The result of two-way ANOVA test for the history achievement is this study can be summarized as Table 6 below.

Table 6: Summary of ANOVA test for Achievement Data in History

Variance Source	Sum of Squares	Degree of Freedom	Mean of Squares	F_0	F_t	
					α = 0.05	α = 0.01
Learning Strategy (P)	1591.77	1	1591.77	24.94	4.45	8.40
Self-concept (Q)	144.13	1	144.13	2.26	4.45	8.40
Interaction (PQ)	5032.72	1	5032.72	78.85	4.45	8.40
In the groups (D)	4085.17	64	63.83	-	-	-
Reduction Total	3007.92	67	-	-	-	-

By reading the summary of ANOVA test for achievement data in history on Table 6, we can know as follow:

1. The Difference of Students' History achievement Based on Learning Strategy

ANOVA two-way test shows that $F_{calculation}$ value = 24.94 which is higher than F_{table} value = 4.45, for significance level of 0.05. This means that H_0 is rejected and H_1 is accepted instead. Then, there is a significant influence between cooperative learning strategy and expository learning to history achievement.

Besides that, the result obtained from ANOVA two-way test also shows the study group with cooperative learning has average score of 70.71 in history. On the other hand, students in expository learning strategy has average of 60.73. Therefore, the test shows that students' history achievement is higher with cooperative learning compared to expository strategy.

2. The Difference of History achievement in Students with High Self-concept based on Learning Strategy

ANOVA two-way test shows that student group with high self-concept and learned with cooperative strategy has got an average score of80.76 in history, whereas the group with high self-concept and learned with expository strategy has got an average score of 53.88 in history. The mean square in ANOVA two-way calculation in 63.83.

In order to know which learning group has got higher history achievement, Tukey's test was run and obtained $Q_{calculation}$ value of 8.02 and Q_{table} value of 4.02 and 5.14 for 0.05 and 0.01 significant levels respectively. With $Q_{calculation}$ value is higher than Q_{table}, H_0 is rejected and H_1 is accepted. This means that students with high self-concept and learned with cooperative strategy have got higher history achievement than those who learned with expository strategy. Tukey's test result is summarized in Table 7 below.

Table 7: The Difference of History achievement in Students with High Self-Concept based on Learning Strategy

Learning Strategy	Cooperative	Expository	$Q_{calculation}$	Q_{table}	
				$\alpha = 0.05$	$\alpha = 0.01$
Average	80.76	53.88	8.02	4.02	5.14
Mean Square	63.83				
Degree of Freedom	64				

3. The Difference of History achievement in Students with Low Self-concept based on Learning Strategy

ANOVA two-way test shows that student group with low self-concept and learned with cooperative strategy has got an average score of 60.65 in history, whereas the group with low self-concept and learned with expository strategy has got an average score of 68.18 in history. The mean square in ANOVA two-way calculation in 63.83.

In order to know which learning group has got higher history achievement, Tukey's test was run and obtained $Q_{calculation}$ value of 6.77 and Q_{table} value of 4.02 for 0.05 significant level. With $Q_{calculation}$ value is higher than Q_{table}, H_0 is rejected and H_1 is accepted. This means that students with high self-concept and learned with cooperative strategy have got lower history achievement than those who learned with expository strategy. Tukey's test result is summarized in Table 8 below.

Table 8: The Difference of History achievement in Students with Low Self-Concept based on Learning Strategy

Learning Strategy	Cooperative	Expository	$Q_{calculation}$	Q_{table}	
				$\alpha = 0.05$	$\alpha = 0,01$
Average	68.18	60.65	6.77	4.02	5.15
Mean Square	63.83				
Degree of Freedom	64				

4. The Influence of Learning Strategy and Self-concept Interaction with the History achievement

The second and third hypothesis tests indicate interaction between learning strategy and self-concept and the influence to history achievement. ANOVA test result supports that indication as the result shows $F_{calculation}$, 78.84, is greater than F_{table} values, 4.45 and 8.40 for 0.05 and 0.01 significant levels respectively and H_0 is rejected while H_1 is accepted. Therefore, there are significant effects of learning strategy and self-concept interaction towards the history achievement.

V. DISCUSSION

With the relation of hypothesis test results, several things need to be discussed further. The first hypothesis test shows the overall students' history achievement with cooperative learning strategy is higher than expository learning. This aligns with several past studies. The research done by Salin (1990) showed that the application of cooperative strategy is able to increase students' academic achievement. The study by Gubbad (2010) showed cooperative learning has a significant influence to improve students' academic achievement. Next, the study by Fini, Zainlipour and Jamri (2012) presented that students taught by cooperative method attained higher academic achievement compared to those taught by traditional method. The research by Toklucu and Tay (2016) concluded that the approach of cooperative learning is effective to increase students' achievement and improve memory towards social studies materials.

The success of cooperative strategy to improve students' history achievement might be caused by the superiority of cooperative strategy. First, there are group goals (group award), which are expressed in theform of group appreciation, to motivate students to learn and help the other group members through review and improvement by peers. As a result, it improves students' learning outcomes (Ngalimun, 2016). According to Leighton (1990) and Nasution (2017), students who learn in collaboration awarding structure tend to work harder to achieve the maximum learning outcomes. Every group will be appreciated if all the members are successful in the learning.

Second is the presence of individual responsibility. With it, cooperative strategy has contributed in the achievement of students' learning. The responsibility will push students to work hard and be serious in learning and task completion. According to Leighton (1990), without individual responsibility, there will not be improvement in academic achievement. Thirdly, there is the same probability of success. With the same opportunity for success in cooperative learning allow better cooperation between students and provide the chance for low-achiever students to have bigger contribution and strengthen students' perception that meaningful academic achievement is attained from students' effort and not from the ability that comes from birth.

The second hypothesis test shows that students with high self-concept obtained higher history achievement with cooperative learning strategy than expository learning. This is predicted to happen because students with high self-concept have got individual goals and responsibility. Those are what needed in the effort of effective group work or success of cooperative learning application. This aligns with Slavin's opinion about two compulsory factors to attain achievement, such as group goals and responsibility from group members (individual) (Slavin, 1995).

Another study done by Mursidah (2002) showed similarities with this study. In other studies, there was interaction found between learning strategy and achievement motivation to students' learning outcomes for mathematics. Students who are highly motivated for high achievement learn better with cooperative learning, whereas students who have low motivation will be better to learn with conventional learning strategy.

The third hypothesis test showed students with low self-concept attained higher history achievement by expository learning compared to cooperative learning. The characters of students with low self-concept are as follow: tend to have less accountability, no desire to attain the best achievement and have less confidence in completion of task assigned. Those conditions, consequently caused students to have difficulties indetermining the direction of the learning activities as students prefer to maintain the habits rather than being interested to changes.

Another indication is that students with low self-concept do not like challenges. They are less independent in the learning process and tend to be dependent to others in completing the tasks. Those characters require more of teachers' roles to direct the learning materials during the learning process. Moreover, in expository learning process, teachers are more active roles than in cooperative learning. This condition helps students' understanding of materials given. Therefore, it can be understood that the average history achievement for students with low self-concept is higher in expository learning than in cooperative learning.

The fourth hypothesis showed interaction between learning strategy with self-concept in affecting history achievement. Students with high self-concept and learned in cooperative learning attained higher achievement compared to those who learned with expository learning. On the contrary, students with low self-concept achieved better with expository learning than cooperative learning. This shows that the effectiveness of one learning strategy correlate with students' characteristics.

Cooperative learning strategy is a learning process in which students work together in small group to reach the group goals. Cooperative learning is indicated by having students to be active and accountable to their teammates. Moreover, they have group goals. Students with high self-concept tend to be eligible in cooperative learning.

Expository learning strategy is material presentations to a big group or a classroom with lecture model and supported by media, question-and-answer session and a few exercise, demonstration and advancement methods. Besides that, expository learning indicated by teachers to have more roles than students. Those differences allow the different needs to support the effectiveness of learning process. Paying attention to students' potential, considering and involving them will help and improve the effectiveness during learning process.

Based on the description above, we can see the suitability between high self-concept students' characters, which are self-adaptable, loving challenges, accountability, expectation to the best achievement and independent, are the conditions needed in cooperative learning. Similarly, students with low self-concept tend to be less adaptable, dislike challenges, be less accountable and independent. Therefore, they need teachers' active roles in the learning process and this makes the learning process to run better.

VI. CONCLUSION

Based on the results from the research and discussion of the findings, it can be concluded that there are differences in history achievement between students taught by cooperative strategy and expository strategy. The highest learning outcomes achieved by students who are taught by cooperative strategy. There are interactions between learning strategy and self-concept towards students' history achievement. For students with high self-concept, the highest history achievement is obtained in students taught by cooperative strategy. Meanwhile, students with low self-concept have better achievement when they are taught with expository strategy.

REFERRENCES

[1]. Al Rasydin dan Wahyudin (2015). Teori Belajar dan Pembelajaran. Medan: Perdana Publishing.
[2]. Anderson, L.W. & Krathwohl, D. R. (2001). A Taxonomy for Learning, Teaching and Assessing: A Revision of Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives. New York: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.
[3]. Arends, R. I. (1998). Learning to Teach. Boston: McGraw-Hill.
[4]. Atwater, E. (1990). Psychology of Adjusment: Personal Growth in a Changing World. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
[5]. Bloom, B. S. (1979). Taxanomy of Educational Objectives. London: Longman.
[6]. Burn, R. B. (1979). The Self Concept. New York: Longman.
[7]. Canfield, J. and Harold C. W. (1976). 100 Ways to Enhance Self-Concept in the Classroom. London: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
[8]. Cooper, J. M. (ed.). (1990). "Cooperative Learning", Classroom Teaching Skills, USA: D. C. Health and Company.
[9]. Creswell, J.W. (2014) Educational Research: Planning, Conducting andEvaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research. London: Person Educational Limited.
[10]. Cruisckshank, D. R., Jenkins, D.B., and Metcalf, K. K. (2006). The Act of Teaching. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
[11]. Crabtree, D. (2001). The Importance of History, Retrived from http://msc.gutenberg.edu/2001/02/the-importance-of-history/
[12]. Ferguson, G. A. & Takane, Y. (1989). Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
[13]. Fini, A.A.S., Zainilipour, H., & Jamri, M. An Investigation into the Effect of Cooperative Learning with Focus on Jigsaw Technique on the Achievement of 2nd grade Middle School Students. Journal of life Science and Biomedicine, 2 (2), 21-24. 2012.
[14]. Fraenkel, J. R & Wallen, N. E. (1993). How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Inc.
[15]. Gagne, R. J. at al. (2005). Principles of Instructional Design. USA : Thomson Learning Inc.
[16]. Gubbad, A. A. M. A. (2010). The Effect Of Cooperative Learning On The Academic Achievement And Retention Of The Mathematics Concept At The Primary School In Holy Makkah. Edu. Sci.& Islamic Studies, 22 (2), 13-23.
[17]. Hasan, A., Ghazli, M., & Ahmad. J. (2011). The Relationship Between Self Concept and Response Towards Student's Academic Achievement Among Leaders in University Putra Malaysia. International Journal of Instruction. 4 (2), 23-34.
[18]. Henson, K. T., & Eller, B.F. (1999). Educational Psychology for Effective Teaching. Boston: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

[19]. Hurlock, E. B. (1974). Personality Development. New York: McGraw-Hill Company, Inc.
[20]. Ibrahim, M., Rachmadiarti, F. N, Nur, M., I. (2006). Pembelajaran Kooperatif.Surabaya: PSMS UNESA.
[21]. Jacobsen, D., E, & Kauchack, D. (1989). Methods for Teaching: A Skill Approach. Colombus, Ohio: Merril Publishing Company.
[22]. Jarolimek, J. & Foster, C. D. (1981). Teaching and Learning in the Elementary School. New York: Macmillan Publishing, Co., Inc.
[23]. Kossylyn, S. M.,& Robin S. R. (2001). Psychology: Brain, The Person, The World. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
[24]. Leighton, M. S. (1990). "Cooperative Learning"Classroom Teaching Skills. ed. James M. Cooper. USA : D. C. Health and Company.
[25]. Meier, M. E. (2004). The Consequences of Being Controlled by Self.(http://www.enter.net/~planetearth/self.htm).
[26]. Miarso, Y. (2004). Menyemai Benih Teknologi Pendidikan. Jakarta: Prenada.
[27]. Mursidah, S. (2002). Pengaruh Strategi Pembelajaran dan Motivasi Berprestasi terhadap Hasil Belajar Matematika . Jakarta: PPS UNJ, 114-115.
[28]. Ngalimun. (2016). Strategi dan Model Pembelajaran. Yogyakarta: Aswaja Pressindo.
[29]. Nair, S. M. & Narayanasamy, M. (2017). "The Effect of Utilising the Concept Maps in Teaching History", International Journal of Instruction, 10(3), 110.
[30]. Nasution, W. N. (2018). The Effectiveness of Teachers' Performance of Islamic Junior High Schoool in Islamic Boarding School Langkat District, Indonesia. Jurnal Ilmiah Peuradeun: The International Journal of Social Sciences. 6 (2), 325-338.
[31]. _____, (2017). Strategi Pembelajaran. Medan: Perdana Publishing.
[32]. _____. (2017). The Effectivenees of STAD Learning Strategy and Expository on The Fiqh Learning Achievent Based on the Students' Self Concept in MTsN Medan Indonesia. The Turkish Online Journal of Design Art and Communication. 1438-1451.
[33]. _____. (2017). The Effects of Learning Model and Achievement Motivation on Natural Science Learning Outcomes of Students at State Islamic Elementary Schools in Medan Indonesia. Journal of Education and Training. 4 (2), 131-150.
[34]. Obeka, S.S. (2014). Repositioning Education through Innovative Teaching on Academic Performance in Practical Geography at SSCE in North Central Nigeria. A Paper Presented at the Multi-Cultural Conference of the Faculty of Education, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria 12th-16th August.
[35]. Ormrod, J. E. (2000). Educational Psychology: Developing Learners. London: Merrill.
[36]. Permendikbud RI No. 21 Tahun 2016.
[37]. Setyawan, D. (2016). Konsep Dasar Sejarah. www.donisetyawan.com/konsep-dasar-sejarah/Sep 2016.
[38]. Slavin, R. E. (1990). Cooperative Learning: Theory, Research, and Practice.Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall..
[39]. Slavin, R. E. (1995). Cooperative Learning: Theory, Research, and Practice. London : Allyn and Bacon.
[40]. Sudjana. (1996). Metoda Statistika. Bandung: Tarsito.
[41]. Suprihatiningrum, J. (2016). Strategi Pemeblajaran: Teori dan Aplikasi. Jogyakarta: Ar-Ruzz Media.
[42]. Toklucu, S. K. & Tay, B. (2016). The Effect of Cooperative Learning Method and Systematic Teaching on Students' Achievement and Retention of Knowledge in Social Studies Lesson, Eurasian Journal of Educational Research,66, 315-334.
[43]. Woolfolk, A. E. (2004). EducationalPsychology. Boston : Allyn and Bacon.
[44]. www.pengetahuan dan teknologi.com/2016/10/tujuan mempelajari-sejarah-indonesia
[45]. Yaumi, Muhammad. (2014). Prinsip-Prinsip Desain Pembelajaran Disesuaikan dengan Kurikulum 2013. Jakarta: Prenada.

Wahyudin Nur Nasution. "The Effect of Using Cooperative Learning Strategy on History Achievementat State Senior High School (MAN) in Medan, Indonesia." IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science (IOSR-JHSS). vol. 24 no. 10, 2019, pp. 65-73.